

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed on 08/30/2007.
2. Claims 1-5, 7-20, and 22-28 are pending in this application. Claims 6 and 21 have been cancelled and claims 1, 5, 13, 15-16, 20 and 28 have been amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 12-13, 15-20, 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,346).

As per claim 1, Janes teaches an electronic commerce method comprising the steps of:

determining at least one e-commerce partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner, wherein determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner comprises at least one of the following steps:

detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period (col.8, lines 19-21, *orders must have occurred within a designated time period to have been made*);

determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold;

determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size; and

determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level (col.8, lines 19-21);

presenting a partner identifier within a commerce graphical user interface for said e-commerce partner, wherein within said commerce graphical user interface the partner identifier is an expandable node (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

presenting an expansion of at least one of said nodes within said commerce graphical user interface (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*); and

for each expansion, presenting at least one transaction identifier as a child node of said expanded node, wherein each transaction identifier represents an electronic commerce transaction between a user of the commerce graphical user interface and said e-commerce partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 expanded presents transaction 901*).

As per claim 2, Janes teaches the method wherein said electronic commerce transactions include at least one business-to-business transaction, and wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one trading partner (Fig.2G, *trading partner Vendor 2*).

As per claim 3, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: providing a business partner gateway, wherein said commerce graphical user interface is an interface for interacting with said business partner gateway (col.3, lines 37-40).

As per claim 4, Janes teaches the method wherein said electronic commerce transactions include at least one business-to-consumer transaction, and wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one consumer (col.3, lines 61-67).

As per claim 5, Janes teaches the method wherein only active partners are displayed in said presenting step (col.8, lines 19-21).

As per claim 8, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: detecting a transmission error; and indicating within said graphical user interface that an error occurred during an associated transmission (Fig.9, col.11, lines 47-55).

As per claim 12, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: categorizing a node associated with at least one of a transmission and an e-commerce partner; and visually differentiating said node from other nodes based upon a category of said node (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 icon different from 901 icon*; col.9, lines 43-45).

As per claim 13, Janes teaches a system for conducting electronic commerce transactions comprising:

- an electronic commerce application configured to conduct electronic commerce transactions between an e-commerce entity and at least one e-commerce partner (col.3, lines 37-65);

- a commerce graphical user interface configured to display electronic commerce transactions in near real time, wherein said displayed electronic commerce transactions are grouped by e-commerce partner (Fig.2G); and

- an active engine configured to categorize e-commerce partners as active partners by performing at least one of the following procedures:

Art Unit: 2174

detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period (col.8, lines 19-21, *orders must have occurred within a designated time period to have been made*);

determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold;

determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size; and

determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level (col.8, lines 19-21).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16-20 are similar in scope to claims 1-5 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7, 9-11, 14, 22, 24-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,346) in view of Xu (US 2004/0119743).

As per claim 7, Janes teaches the method where only active partners are displayed (Janes, col.8, lines 19-21). However, Janes does not teach the method further comprising the step of providing an administrative graphical user interface configured to adjust at least one parameter used to define whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner. Xu teaches a method of displaying transactions in a commerce environment wherein a parameter may be adjusted to display only those transactions associated an active partner (Xu, para.0077). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Xu's teaching with Janes' method in order to filter out relevant information.

As per claim 9, Janes teaches the method comprising the step of receiving a selection specifying a node of said graphical user interface (Janes, col.9, lines 29-30). However, Janes does not teach the step of responsively establishing a communication session between a user of said commerce graphical user interface and the e-commerce partner associated with said node. Xu teaches a method of displaying transactions in a commerce environment wherein a communication session may be established between a user and partner (Xu, para.0078, para.0093). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Xu's teaching with Janes' method in order to interact with partners in real-time.

As per claim 10, Xu teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said communication session is an instant messaging session (para.0094).

As per claim 11, Xu teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said establishing step further comprises the steps of: selecting a communication channel and establishing said communication session through said communication channel (para.0094).

Claim 14 and 28 are individually similar in scope to claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 24-26 are similar in scope to claims 9-11 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 08/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

a) No automatic determination is made in determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner.

b) Janes fails to provide any mechanism for determining whether a particular customer is an active customer. In particular, Janes does not detect whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period; determine whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold; determine whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size; or determine whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per a), In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., automatic determination) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Per b), Janes teaches the display of active partners to be those customers with orders (col.8, lines 19-21) which is the step of detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period. Orders must have occurred within a designated time period to have been made. In addition, Applicant's specification states that partners with pending transactions can be considered active partners (Applicant spec, para.0026).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4065**.

Art Unit: 2174

The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sy D Luu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174
/S. M./